

1
2
3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
4 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

5 JERMAINE HAMPTON,

Case No. 2:24-cv-01504-GMN-EJY

6 Petitioner,

7 v.

ORDER

8 JEREMY BEAN, et al.,

9 Respondents.

10 Respondents filed a Motion for Enlargement of Time to Respond to Petitioner Jermaine
11 Hampton's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (First Request) ("Motion" (ECF No. 13)).
12 Respondents request a 60-day extension of time, up to and including January 17, 2025, because
13 counsel's workload prevented completion of the response by the initial deadline of November
14 18, 2024. Hampton filed a response to the motion opposing a 60-day extension of time. (ECF
15 No. 14.) Hampton argues Respondents were initially given 60-days to file their response and
16 have not demonstrated cause or purpose for the additional delay. (*Id.*) Hampton asks the Court
17 to grant Respondents only a 30-day extension of time. (*Id.*) Respondents did not file a reply and
18 the time to do so has expired. Due to the complexity of the claims, and conditions set forth in
19 counsel's declaration in support of the Motion, the Court finds the request is made in good faith
20 and not solely for the purpose of delay, and therefore good cause exists to grant the motion.

21 It is therefore ordered that Respondents' Motion for Enlargement of Time to Respond to
22 the Petition (First Request) [ECF No. 13] is **granted**. Respondents have until January 17, 2025,
23 to file their response to the Petition.

24 DATED: December 5, 2024

25
26
27
28


GLORIA M. NAVARRO
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE